

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the remarks and analysis contained in the Office Action. Amendments to claims 1, 2 and 14 are presented above. Claim 19 has been cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

The objection to claim 19 can be withdrawn.

Given that claim 19 is cancelled, that objection can be withdrawn.

**The rejection of claims 1-6 and 19-23
under 35 U.S.C. §103 can be withdrawn.**

The proposed combination of the two *Aulanko* references and the *Yamamori* reference does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against claim 1 as presented above. Neither of the *Aulanko* references includes a drive sheave having an outside dimension that is less than or equal to a dimension of support columns as recited in claim 1. As can be appreciated from Applicant's Figure 1, the support columns 24 and 26 in that example embodiment each have a dimension in a direction from the sidewall to the elevator car and perpendicular to the axis of rotation of the drive sheave. The drive sheave 42 has an outside dimension in that same direction that is less than or equal to that dimension of the support columns. Such an arrangement cannot be found in either of the *Aulanko* references.

If one considers the EP 0710618 document, the traction sheave 7 has a width dimension perpendicular to the axis of rotation of the traction sheave 7 that is clearly larger than a correspondingly oriented dimension of any of the guiderails 10, 11, 11a. Similarly, the traction sheave 4 in the EP 0688735 document has an outside diameter in a direction perpendicular to the axis of rotation of the traction sheave 4 that is clearly larger than a correspondingly oriented dimension of the guiderail 6.

Given that Applicant's claimed arrangement includes a dimensional relationship between an outside dimension of the drive sheave and the support columns that is not shown in any of the *Aulanko, et al.* or *Yamamori* references, there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness even if those references could be combined.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is generic to all of the claims that have previously been withdrawn from consideration. Applicant respectfully submits that all of those claims be allowed along with claim 1 and the other claims that are currently under consideration.

Applicant respectfully submits that this case is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes that no additional fees are necessary, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482 in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

By: 

David J. Gaskey, Reg. No. 37,139
400 W. Maple Rd., Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: July 6, 2010